1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>ex rel.</i> SCOTT ROSE, et al.
8	Plaintiff(s), No. C 09-5966 PJH
9	V. ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
10	STEPHENS INSTITUTE,  DISMISS
11 12	Defendant(s).
13	Defendant Stephens Institute's motion to dismiss came on for hearing before this
14	court on June 27, 2012. Plaintiff-relators Scott Rose, Mary Aquino, Mitchell Nelson, and
15	Lucy Stearns ("plaintiffs") appeared through their counsel, Stephen R. Jaffe and Martha A.
16	Boersch. Defendant Stephens Institute ("defendant") appeared through its counsel, Steven
17	M. Gombos and Leland B. Altschuler. Having read the papers filed in conjunction with the
18	motion and carefully considered the arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good
19	
20	amended complaint, as the complaint sufficiently states a claim under Rule 12(b)(6) and
21	meets the particularity requirements of Rule 9(b).
22	In support of its motion to dismiss, defendant concurrently filed a request for judicial
23	notice. Because the court does find that judicial notice is appropriate here, defendant's
24	request is hereby GRANTED.
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	Dated: June 28, 2012
27	United States District Judge
/^	